

Manuscript: “**Improving Polymer Science Asynchronous Online Lecture Contents For Students’ Engagement**”

Submitted: 17 May 2021

Accepted: 01 July 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Charles Darko

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p95

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Aleksey Khlopytskyi, Ukrainian State University of Chemical Technology, Ukraine

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The title is clear and adequate

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, the abstract presents clearly objects, methods, and results

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

The manuscript is well written

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Methods are clear

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the paper is clear

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

In the conclusion I would add a paragraph that open the discussion to other topics (either within chemistry or other scientific subjects) in which it is important the engagement of students in asynchronous online lectures

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The list of References is accurate and comprehensive

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The section "reading information from the computer screen" is not well connected to the rest of the manuscript.

After a well-documented technical discussion, it has been stated that "a study on the utilization of an eye-tracking technique to examine the relationships between students' visual behaviours and their cognitive structures, as well as their information processing modes, suggested that instructors must provide more varied and integrated information for students' reading tasks to enhance and enrich students' cognitive structures".

However, in my opinion it is not clear how the study proposed in this manuscript follows the suggestions by Wang et al.

Moreover, in the conclusion an integration between the eye-tracking studies and the findings of the manuscript is not reported.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Correspondence exists among the title of the article and its content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The ABSTRACT fulfills its internal structure: problem, objective, methods, results and conclusions.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

They were not grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The methodology used in the investigation is presented correctly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

-In the epigraph "The teaching of polymer science" outdated bibliography is used, because the most recent dates of the year 2005.

-The chart 1 and the figure 1 don't make an appointment in the text of the article.

-You doesn't discuss the information that is presented in the chart 1.

-You not explicit the objective of the investigation in the INTRODUCTION.

-It lacks internal logic in the article, because most of the information that appears in the epigraphs: "Cognitive processes", "Computer screen design", "Education level and

computer usage", "Education level and prior knowledge", they constitute theoretical foundations that should be presented in the INTRODUCTION.

-The APPENDIXes are not mentioned in the text of the article, in the corresponding place.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The CONCLUSIONS are extremely long, although yes they are sustained in the RESULTS and their DISCUSSION of the article.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

-Keeping in mind that it is an investigation article it presents many bibliographical sources, 56 in total.

-Of them only the 44.6% is of the last 10 years and 33.9% of the last five years, for what those references should be modernized that you/they have more than 10 years that are 31.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *BODY* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *CONCLUSION* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *REFERENCES* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

It is not entirely clear what specific methods the authors used?

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

It is not entirely clear what methods the authors used. The choice of topics by students does not belong to research methods.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The text of the article is quite clear. Only the research methods are not clear. As discussed above.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Yes. It is advisable to provide links to articles no more than 7-10 years old.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To specify the research methods used by the authors. In this regard, changes are required in the abstract, methods and conclusion. The literature list is outdated research.

During the period of COVID, they intensively study and switch to distance education methods.